

Date: Sun, 5 Dec 93 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #513
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 5 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 513

Today's Topics:

 This is a hobby not a
 Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
 W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns" (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 03 Dec 93 04:26:16 EST
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!
sdd.hp.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: This is a hobby not a
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <1993Dec2.062946.10274@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
> Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
> >Fortunately that's changing. Many of the new amateurs are very excited
> >by the possibilities of wireless networking.
>
> That's simply not the case around here. Send me a few, and I might just
> believe you; as things stand, all the new hams I've seen just want to yak on
> meters.

Jay, I am not suprised that is all you see. That is what you WANT to see.

> >I know how you feel, I reached burnout a couple of years ago. It's

> >not much fun banging your head into a wall. But things are changing
> >now, and I'm excited again.
>
> I'm burned out on packet at the moment myself; the machine I had running
> fulltime packet died a coupla months ago, and I haven't gotten up the energy
> to fix it yet. The state of packet around here hasn't been helped at all by
> the influx of the codeless tech, either...not one technical advance in sight.

If you are that disinterested in it, how can you be so UP on what the current state is? And again, coded hams major advance was to supply a BIG market for used Commodore 64's!

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----  
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
-----
```

Date: 2 Dec 93 08:58:09 CST
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!caen!kuhub.cc.ukans.edu!wsuhub.uc.twsu.edu!
mwreed@ames.arpa
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The 440 HT would be illegal to use on GMRS, as an everyday radio for GMRS use. But the situation comes up for handling emergency communications it would be okay. On the amateur side of the regs take a look at 97.405 (the subsection that talks about emergency assistance) and also in the part 95 (don't know that part number right off) where it talks about communications with the amateur radio service in emergency operations.

The dealer was also correct in saying that a type excepted radio was required on GMRS. There's a little thing that they made up a few years back that radios in the Commercial Land Mobile and GMRS could not be user programmable (like the amateur radio transceiver are).

I'll up additional information on this for anyone wanting the regulation sections and parts.

Marlen
mwreed@wsuhub.uc.twsu.edu
n0pco@n0pco.scks.ks.usa.noam

Date: Wed, 1 Dec 1993 21:01:32 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:

> Never mind upgrades. [potentially heard on 7.010 SSB] "Yes I know this is the
> Extra subband. I passed all the elements for Extra in one day, so you can't
> make me leave, nyah nyah. WZ6LID monitoring"...

Heh heh. Yeah, really...

> Boy you think no-codes get bashed, wait til they have no-calls ;-)

A no-call... Hey, I like that...

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: Fri, 03 Dec 93 04:30:03 EST
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!caen!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mebly@eng.umd.edu (Mark E. Bailey) writes:

> In article <2dlnpt\$13jb@msuinfo.cl.msu.edu> cravitma@arctic2.uucp (Matthew B
> >In article <1993Dec2.163624.5800@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Mi
> >>[...]
> >
> >How about doing this : KD1HZ/T(year)(number). So the first ham you
> >license next year would be KD1HZ/T931. The 500'th would be KD1HZ/T93500.
> > [...]
> >
> You can't do it this way. (HINT: Ever wonder why /AT isn't used for
> technician upgrades?) Use AA instead. This sounds like an excellent way to
> maintain some accountability.

But why not do it in REAL time. There is no valid reason why it can not be done.

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----
```

```
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
-----
```

Date: 4 Dec 93 21:28:40 GMT
From: world!dts@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CHE2Io.7Bp@walter.bellcore.com>, <1993Dec2.194250.14040@cs.brown.edu>,
<CHG6z5.85v@walter.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!!!

In article <CHG6z5.85v@walter.bellcore.com> whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com
(sohl,william h) writes:

>In article <1993Dec2.194250.14040@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>>

>>> Mike, who told you that?

>>

>>I used to offer copies of test preparation programs (shareware programs)

>>on a weekly net I run. I also told people they could dial into my

>>amateur radio server and download them.

>>

>>I was approached by a senior VE in RI and told that my actions where

>>a violation of Part 97. Therefore, I sent some e-mail to Bart Jahnke,

>>ARRL VEC coordinator, and asked him. The reply that I got back was that

>>it was, in fact, not appropriate for me to offer testing programs to

>>people nor through my amateur radio filesaver.

>>-- Michael P. Deignan

>

>Mike, using their logic, it would be inappropriate for a VE to give

>a prospective ham (or a ham that wants to upgrade) a copy of the

>ARRL handbook. That's sure not what I read in theARRL VE guide.

>If the shareware program you had available was available elsewhere

>also, I see nothing wrong with what you did that would be any

>type of conflict. I think the "interpretation" in the minds

>of the VE that was critical and the ARRL VEC coordinator was
>an overstatement. My understanding of potential conflict would
>be whereby you engaged in direct support (teaching, and or providing
>study materials) for classes of new/upgrading hams. If you did that
>then you should NOT serve as a VE for any test session that has
>any of those "students' in it. On the other hand, if you just
>give someone a copy of the ARRL handbook, or a shareware program, etc.
>and that isn't a part of some formal training program you offer
>then I see no conflict. Anyway, that's how I view it.

Well, I have to agree with Mike on this one. As an instructor of radio classes, and a VE, I asked LOTS of questions on this subject of the VEC (Bart at ARRL). What I was told was that I could not "hand out" materials, books or anything else. Words spoken and diagrams drawn on the blackboard were not considered as having been handed out.

Some of this is not necessarily stuff that is or is not in the ARRL VE manual, but rather the result of various statements of the FCC and such (all of which got to me second hand, but which were confirmed in my discussion with Bart.

Because it impacts my ability to teach classes, and as Section Manager I am VERY likely to be in positions where I need to give out materials which might contain testing information (eg. Now You're Talking), I probably will do as Mike did, and mail my VE tag back to ARRL HQ. What's really sad is that you cannot hand someone a copy of Now You're Talking that they could pick up at any RS store themselves. How can the fact that you bought the book for them and handed it to them possibly make a difference? It defies logic.

Dan Senie N1JEB SM WMA

— —

Daniel Senie	Internet:	dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting		n1jeb@world.std.com
508-365-5352	Compuserve:	74176,1347

Date: 3 Dec 1993 07:31:17 -0500
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!pagesat!netsys!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
noc.near.net!genrad.com!genrad.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CHDrv6.LIL@world.std.com>, <1993Dec2.165112.6634@cs.brown.edu>,
<2dlomg\$10a2@msuinfo.cl.msu.edu>near.ne
Subject : Re: WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!!!

In article <2dlomg\$10a2@msuinfo.cl.msu.edu> cravitma@arctic2.uucp (Matthew B Cravit) writes:

>In article <1993Dec2.165112.6634@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:

>>

>>> Ummm, you HAVE applied for your VE tags, haven't you? Generals are allowed

>>> as VE's now, as part of the same ruling that got rid of the 2 generals thing.

>>

>>Yes, I applied for and received them years ago. I sent them back after

>>being told I couldn't help people out by distributing computerized

>>test materials, etc., on my ftp site.

>

>As I understand things, the only prohibition is that you are not

>allowed to _TEACH_ a class, and then be a VE for that class. Free

>distribution of materials and information is still perfectly OK. Note

>that this is secondhand information, so I could be wrong...

I agree. I distribute testing material to those who ask and I'm still a VE (for both ARRL and W5YI). The only proviso is that the stuff is FREE and NOT distributed at a testing session. I know of a number of VEs who also TEACH ham radio classes. Seeing that the VEs are volunteering their time and the Teachers are volunteering their time, I don't see this as a problem.

Diana

--

->Diana L. Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea) <-

->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST CAP: CPT, Freedom 690M, MAWG<-

->GenRad, 300 Baker Ave MS/1, Concord, MA 01742 (508)369-4400 x2459 <-

Date: 3 Dec 1993 16:35:12 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpubmaa.esr.hp.com!

garhow@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <DRT.93Nov30083123@world.std.com>, <2dfoa2\$68d@hpscit.sc.hp.com>,<1993Dec1.001017.936@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>

Subject : Re: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

In article <1993Dec1.001017.936@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,<1993Dec1.001017.936@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>

kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:

|> It is the sheer number of CBers which created the mess on 11m. I'm sure

|> that's what you meant, Garry, but I would like to expand and clarify the point:

|>

|> It is the sheer number of people operating in the CB bands that have made

|> them what they are. In any cross-section of society you are going to have
|> some number of nitwits. The larger the sample, the larger the number of
|> nitwits. During the CB boom, the number of users of CB increased extremely

You are absolutely right on this point!!

|>
|> I and others have said this before: we must not sacrifice quality for
|> quantity. Therefore our licensing requirements must ensure quality first;
|> if that means there will be people left out of the Service, so be it. We
|> are better off without them.
|>

While licensing requirements certainly help, it is not going to prevent
someone who has no respect for the license in the first place and just
wants to create havoc from getting a radio and getting on the air.

|> Arguing that it is in the best interest of the Service to continue expansion
|> with no target upper bound may be in the best interest of the equipment
|> manufacturers but is certainly not in the best interest of the Service.
|> What happened on the CB band would happen in the amateur bands just as easily,
|> if the Amateur Service were to experience the kind of growth that occurred
|> in CB.
|>
|> To answer the question posed by the subject line, for those who can't infer
|> the answer from the above discourse, ham is not like CB because there are
|> not as many hams as CBers. Simple as that.
|>

While it is true that problems increase relative to the numbers, this is
not the only reason ham is not like CB. We are fortunate that the ham bands
have an established operating procedure that, for the most part, encourages
professional and courteous behaviour. This is not 100% successful, but it
certainly helps. Again, I am not convinced that increasing problems on the
ham bands and deterioration of operating procedures is directly related to
one aspect of the licensing requirements, specifically learning code. If
someone has no respect for the regulations or other people and just wants
to cause trouble no licensing requirements are going to stop him if he
has easy access to radio equipment.

As far as new licensees joining the ranks, they must be trained in the
established procedures and taught by example. Ignoring, degrading, or
criticizing them will not help. I think we can be much more successful by
welcoming, encouraging, and mentoring them. As for the malicious
troublemakers, I don't have a solution.

--

Garry Howard - KE0SH

Hewlett-Packard Company

Technical Consultant 29 Burlington Mall Road
Professional Services Organization Burlington, MA 01803 USA
garhow@hpubmaa.esr.hp.com

[I do not speak for HP officially or otherwise.]

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #513
